AI Report

We are not confident this text is

Human Generated

AI Probability

39%

This number is the probability that the document is AI generated, not a percentage of AI text in the document.

Plagiarism

?

The plagiarism scan was not run for this document. Go to gptzero.me to check for plagiarism.

Answer: - 1/19/2025

Haishan Yang

Answer:

A.

1. Three market failures that are most discussed in health economics are adverse selection, moral hazard and monopoly.

Economic inefficiency occurs when resources are not used in a way that maximizes the potential output or welfare. It represents a situation where goods and services are not distributed or produced optimally, leading to a loss of potential economic value or social welfare. In other words, economic efficiency relates to Pareto efficiency and Productive efficiency.

1.1 Adverse selection

In the presence of adverse selection, Pareto efficiency is compromised because the market does not achieve the optimal allocation of resources. Specifically:

1. Suboptimal Insurance Coverage: Low-risk individuals, who value insurance at a lower premium, drop out of the market because the premiums are set too high to cover the high-risk individuals. As a result, these low-risk individuals remain uninsured, which is suboptimal from a welfare perspective.

2. Market Exclusion: When adverse selection drives premiums up, it excludes some

individuals who would otherwise benefit from insurance, leading to a scenario where improving one party's welfare (by providing insurance to low-risk individuals) would require redistributing the risk and potentially making high-risk individuals worse off.

One could also argue that adverse selection leads to loss of productivity efficiency, because it increases administrative cost because insurers may need to invest more in underwriting and screening processes to better assess and price individual risk.

Theoretical arguments suggest that adverse selection leads to inefficiency because insurance markets fail to pool risk effectively, leading to underinsurance or complete market breakdowns. According to the seminal work by Rothschild and Stiglitz (1976), in competitive insurance markets with asymmetric information, separating equilibria can arise where different risk types are offered different contracts. However, these equilibria are often inefficient as they do not achieve risk pooling, resulting in welfare losses.

Abundant empirical evidence shows adverse selection leads to large costs in terms of economic inefficiency. Brown, Duggan, Kuziemko, and Woolston (2014) highlight the adverse selection issues in Medicare Advantage, showing that actual costs conditional on the risk score of those joining Medicare Advantage fell substantially after 2003, relative to those remaining in traditional Medicare. We can see retrospectively that adverse selection indeed caused large efficiency loss, that is why after addrssing adverse selection, costs fell.

1.2 Moral Hazard

Moral hazard can lead to a loss of economic efficiency, impacting both Pareto efficiency and productive efficiency.

First, Moral hazard leads to a loss of Pareto efficiency because of following reasons:

1. Overconsumption of Healthcare Services: Insured individuals may consume more healthcare services than necessary because the insurance covers a significant portion of the cost. This overconsumption leads to an allocation of resources that is not optimal, as the marginal benefit of the additional healthcare services consumed is less than the marginal cost of providing them.

2. Resource Misallocation: The increased demand for healthcare services due to moral

hazard can lead to a misallocation of resources within the healthcare system. Resources that could be used more efficiently elsewhere are instead used to provide services of marginal benefit to the insured individuals.

Second, Moral hazard leads to a loss of Productive efficiency because of following reasons:

1. Increased Healthcare Costs: The overutilization of healthcare services due to moral hazard increases the overall cost of healthcare provision.

2. Inefficient Use of Resources: Moral hazard can result in the inefficient use of healthcare resources.

Theoretical models, such as those developed by Pauly (1968), illustrate how moral hazard leads to overconsumption of healthcare services, deviating from the socially optimal level of care. The model posits that when individuals are fully insured, the marginal cost of consuming healthcare services is zero, leading to a higher quantity demanded than what would be optimal if they were paying out-of-pocket. Empirical evidence corroborates these theoretical predictions. The RAND Health Insurance Experiment found that individuals with more generous insurance coverage consumed significantly more healthcare services without corresponding improvements in health outcomes, indicating inefficient overuse of healthcare resources (Aron-Dine, Einav, and Finkelstein, 2013). However, it should be noted that the debate about the impact of RAND HIE is still ongoing, and there might be long-term health benefits. If there is an improvement in long-term health benefit, we should not view it as an example of moral hazard.

1.3 Monopoly

Market concentration or monopoly can also lead to both Pareto efficiency and productive efficiency.

First, loss of Pareto Efficiency:

1. Higher Prices for Healthcare Services: Providers with significant market power can charge higher prices for healthcare services than they would in a competitive market.

2. Reduced Access to Care: Higher prices can also lead to reduced access to healthcare for some individuals, especially those with lower incomes or inadequate insurance coverage. This reduced access results in a misallocation of resources, as some individuals forego

necessary care due to cost, while others may receive more than they need.

Second, loss of Productive Efficiency:

1. Higher Production Costs: When providers have market power, they may face less pressure to operate efficiently. Without competitive pressure, there is less incentive to minimize costs, leading to higher production costs for healthcare services.

2. Reduced Innovation: In a competitive market, providers have incentives to innovate and improve their services to attract more patients. Market power can reduce these incentives, leading to less innovation and slower improvements in the quality and efficiency of healthcare services.

Classic microeconomic theory such as monopolistic competition or duopoly indicate that increased market concentration among healthcare providers can lead to monopolistic behavior, resulting in prices that exceed the marginal cost of service provision. This pricing power distorts the market, reducing the overall welfare by decreasing consumer surplus and increasing the deadweight loss. Empirical evidence supports the high welfare costs associated with provider market power.

Empirical evidence supports the high welfare costs associated with provider market power. Studies have shown that hospital mergers often result in significant price increases without corresponding improvements in the quality of care. For example, research by Dafny, Ho, and Lee (2019) found that hospital consolidations led to significant price increases. Specifically, hospitals that gain system members within the same state but in different local markets experience a price increase of 7-10 percent relative to control hospitals. In summary, an increase in price deters people going to hospital more frequently, leading to allocation efficiency.

Answer:

B.

I select adverse selection as a market failure to be discussed here.

To address adverse selection, one effective public policy is the implementation of risk adjustment in health insurance markets. Risk adjustment involves transferring funds from insurers with relatively healthier enrollees to those with sicker enrollees, thereby reducing the incentives for

insurers to select against high-risk individuals. This policy aims to level the playing field by compensating insurers for taking on higher-risk populations, thus promoting economic efficiency.

Geruso, Layton, McCormack, and Shepard (2021) provides a detailed analysis of risk adjustment and its impacts on adverse selection across both the extensive (whether to buy insurance) and intensive (which plan to buy) margins. The paper highlights the following points regarding risk adjustment:

Reduction of Intensive Margin Adverse Selection: Risk adjustment transfers help to balance the costs between more generous and less generous plans. By compensating insurers for enrolling higher-cost individuals, these transfers reduce the incentive for insurers to design plans that attract only healthier individuals. This, in turn, mitigates the issue of plan choice being driven by health status, which can stabilize the market for more generous plans.

Interactions with Extensive Margin: The study shows that while risk adjustment primarily targets the intensive margin by reducing selection within the market, it also indirectly impacts the extensive margin. For instance, stronger risk adjustment can lower the premiums for more generous plans, making them more attractive to healthier individuals and potentially reducing the uninsurance rate. However, there are trade-offs, as seen in their simulations where stronger risk adjustment sometimes led to increased premiums for less generous plans, which could affect overall market participation.

Empirical Evidence from Massachusetts: Using data from the Massachusetts health insurance exchange, the authors simulate different policy scenarios and find that risk adjustment has significant impacts on equilibrium prices and enrollment. Stronger risk adjustment reduces the premiums for more generous plans, leading to higher enrollment in these plans and a more balanced distribution of health risks across plans.

In conclusion, Risk adjustment transfers are an effective public policy tool for addressing adverse selection in health insurance markets. By redistributing funds based on the risk profiles of enrollees, risk adjustment mitigates the financial incentives for insurers to select healthier individuals and encourages a more balanced risk pool. This policy improves economic efficiency

by stabilizing premiums and promoting competition based on plan quality and efficiency rather than risk selection. The empirical evidence from the Massachusetts health insurance market supports the effectiveness of risk adjustment in achieving these goals, demonstrating its potential to enhance overall welfare in regulated health insurance markets.

Reference:

- Brown, J., Duggan, M., Kuziemko, I., & Woolston, W. (2014). How does risk selection respond to risk adjustment? Evidence from the Medicare Advantage program. American Economic Review, 104(10), 3335-3364.
- Aron-Dine, A., Einav, L., & Finkelstein, A. (2013). The RAND Health Insurance Experiment, Three Decades Later. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27(1), 197-222.
- Dafny, L., Ho, K., & Lee, R. S. (2018). The Price Effects of Cross-Market Mergers: Theory and Evidence from the Hospital Industry. Journal of Economic Perspectives.
- Rothschild, M., & Stiglitz, J. (1976). Equilibrium in competitive insurance markets: An essay on the economics of imperfect information. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 90(4), 629-649.
- Pauly, Mark, “The Economics of Moral Hazard: Comment,” American Economic Review 58 (June, 1968), 531-537.
- Geruso, M., Layton, T. J., McCormack, G., & Shepard, M. (2023). The two-margin problem in insurance markets. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 105(2), 237-257

FAQs

What is GPTZero?

GPTZero is the leading AI detector for checking whether a document was written by a large language model such as ChatGPT. GPTZero detects AI on sentence, paragraph, and document level. Our model was trained on a large, diverse corpus of human-written and AI-generated text, with a focus on English prose. To date, GPTZero has served over 2.5 million users around the world, and works with over 100 organizations in education, hiring, publishing, legal, and more.

When should I use GPTZero?

Our users have seen the use of AI-generated text proliferate into education, certification, hiring and recruitment, social writing platforms, disinformation, and beyond. We've created GPTZero as a tool to highlight the possible use of AI in writing text. In particular, we focus on classifying AI use in prose. Overall, our classifier is intended to be used to flag situations in which a conversation can be started (for example, between educators and students) to drive further inquiry and spread awareness of the risks of using AI in written work.

Does GPTZero only detect ChatGPT outputs?

No, GPTZero works robustly across a range of AI language models, including but not limited to ChatGPT, GPT-4, GPT-3, GPT-2, LLaMA, and AI services based on those models.

What are the limitations of the classifier?

The nature of AI-generated content is changing constantly. As such, these results should not be used to punish students. We recommend educators to use our behind-the-scene Writing Reports as part of a holistic assessment of student work. There always exist edge cases with both instances where AI is classified as human, and human is classified as AI. Instead, we recommend educators take approaches that give students the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding in a controlled environment and craft assignments that cannot be solved with AI. Our classifier is not trained to identify AI-generated text after it has been heavily modified after generation (although we estimate this is a minority of the uses for AI-generation at the moment). Currently, our classifier can sometimes flag other machine-generated or highly procedural text as AI-generated, and as such, should be used on more descriptive portions of text.

I'm an educator who has found AI-generated text by my students. What do I do?

Firstly, at GPTZero, we don't believe that any AI detector is perfect. There always exist edge cases with both instances where AI is classified as human, and human is classified as AI. Nonetheless, we recommend that educators can do the following when they get a positive detection: Ask students to demonstrate their understanding in a controlled environment, whether that is through an in-person assessment, or through an editor that can track their edit history (for instance, using our Writing Reports through Google Docs). Check out our list of several recommendations on types of assignments that are difficult to solve with AI.

Ask the student if they can produce artifacts of their writing process, whether it is drafts, revision histories, or brainstorming notes. For example, if the editor they used to write the text has an edit history (such as Google Docs), and it was typed out with several edits over a reasonable period of time, it is likely the student work is authentic. You can use GPTZero's Writing Reports to replay the student's writing process, and view signals that indicate the authenticity of the work.
See if there is a history of AI-generated text in the student's work. We recommend looking for a long-term pattern of AI use, as opposed to a single instance, in order to determine whether the student is using AI.